

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: BRUCE WESSON

SERIAL NO.: 10/730,744

GROUP ART UNIT: 2821

FILED: 12/08/2003

EXAMINER: ALEMU, Ephrem

FOR: "Loaded LED Bulbs for Incandescent/Flourescent/Neon/Xenon/Halogen Bulbs
Replacement in Load Sensitive Applications and more"

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: P02258US (98525.1P3)

* * * * *

RESPONSE

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a response and an amendment to the office action dated 5 April 2006. A shortened statutory period was set to expire three months from the date of the Office Action, making a response due by July 5, 2006.

REMARKS

Claims 39-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Eggers. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The claims are drawn to an LED bulb which is adaptable to an application with a load/resistance to match impedance/resistance requirements of the application, the bulb including at least one LED and a load. Eggers, on the other hand, does not claim a bulb, nor does Eggers' circuit attempt to match the impedance/resistance requirements of an application. Rather, Eggers discloses a circuit which attempts to alter the light output of an LED such that its luminance matches that of an incandescent bulb which it replaces. If the circuit of Eggers were used to replace an incandescent bulb, it might have a higher or lower resistance than the bulb, depending on what type and configuration of LEDs are used. It is extremely unlikely that such a circuit would match the resistance of the bulb. Therefore, Eggers does not anticipate claims 39-54.

Claims 49 and 56-59 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-